DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 652 HE 033 504

AUTHOR Kezar, Adrianna J.
TITLE Faculty: ERIC Trends, 1999-2000.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, DC.; George Washington Univ., Washington, DC. Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 2000-00-00
NOTE 12p.; For related documents, see HE 033 500-506.
AVAILABLE FROM For full text: http://www.eriche.org.
PUB TYPE ERIC Publications (071)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aging in Academia; *College Faculty; *Diversity (Faculty); Doctoral Programs; Educational Technology; *Educational Trends; Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; *Faculty Workload; Full Time Faculty; *Higher Education; Nontenured Faculty; Part Time Faculty; Tenured Faculty; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) Trends are analyses of higher education literature contained in the ERIC database, describing major concerns in institutional practice. There has been little real change in the literature on faculty in the last 5 years. Workload for faculty remains higher than many professions, and faculty often experience acute conflict as a result of the various roles they must assume. Advocates for new approaches continue to propose new visions. Some newer trends in the literature that higher educators need to be aware of include: (1) the new faculty: older, not more ethnically diverse; (2) internationalized faculty; (3) growth of part-time/contractual faculty; (4) new definitions of research: technology, application, and revenue generation; (5) fall of tenure and rise of productivity/workload; (6) collective bargaining; (7) rewarding service and the scholarship of teaching; (8) aligning priorities/rewards and mission; and (9) restructuring doctoral programs. Every aspect of the faculty role is being reconceptualized. Workload, attacks of tenure, changing roles, and lack of diversity among faculty have been themes throughout the 1990s. The restructuring of doctoral programs, the scholarship of teaching, and the rewarding of service show promise for assisting in this time of transition. However, the rise in part-time and contract faculty, the growing antagonism represented in the growth of collective bargaining, and the lack of diversification of faculty represent serious looming problems. These interrelated issues need to be examined together, as they typically are engaged. (Contains 22 references.) (EMS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 652

ERIC TRENDS 1999-2000:

FACULTY

by Adrianna J. Kezar

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
Institute for Education Policy Studies
Graduate School of Education and Human Development
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183

View this and other higher education documents on our Web site at www.eriche.org

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE033504

What are ERIC Trends?

Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) Trends are analyses of higher education literature contained in the ERIC Database. These analyses describe major concerns in institutional practice, helping researchers identify new areas for research, areas where further understanding is needed, and any gaps in the literature. For practitioners, ERIC Trends place individual institutional shifts in practice into a larger context. They provide individual institutions with examples of other institutions that are trying to make the same changes and help institutions identify other areas they should consider for change.

Slightly more than half of the literature summarized in ERIC Trends is drawn from higher education journals. The remainder of the literature summarized includes conference papers and documents published by educational associations, institutional research offices, research centers, consortia, and state and federal associations and boards. The literature is produced by both the research and practice communities. It is a combination of current theory and research, such as conference papers and Internet documents, and more dated literature, such as books and journal articles, which take several years to evolve from acceptance to publication. A limitation of this analysis is that it relies on the literature ERIC is able to obtain from authors and organizations; some groups may be unwilling to share information and, therefore, are not represented in the analysis. The range of documents analyzed in the ERIC Trends is fairly comprehensive, however.

To retrieve the literature for analysis, all of the higher education literature in the ERIC database was searched by the ERIC descriptors that reflect the most important topics in higher education: college faculty; college students (including foreign students); finance; college instruction (including academic advising); curriculum; program evaluation; policy and governance; legal issues; professional development; college administration (including educational facilities); higher education and the public good; and professional and graduate education. A quantitative analysis compared the current number of documents within a particular category to earlier years (back to 1986). A qualitative analysis of content was conducted on ERIC abstracts to identify recurring themes.

Higher Education Trends (1999-2000): Faculty

by Adrianna J. Kezar

The literature on faculty is similar to that of administration-- less ground breaking, and focused on familiar themes of role definition, workload, attitudes, preparation, role stress, etc. These are important issues for consideration and occasionally there are changes in these conditions, yet there has been little real change in the last five years. Workload for faculty remains higher than many professional positions. Faculty also experience acute conflict as a result of the various roles they must assume. Faculty continue to have fairly high morale, even though external forces are pushing for changes in their roles. Graduate preparation remains virtually unchanged and advocates for new approaches continue to propose new visions. Teaching and service remain areas not well understood or documented.

Although the literature is replete with common themes, there are also some newer trends in the literature that higher educators need to be aware of, including:

1. The new faculty: older, not more ethnically diverse
2. Internationalized faculty
3. Growth of part-time/contract faculty
4. New definitions of research: technology, application, and revenue generation
5. Fall of tenure and rise of productivity/workload
6. Collective bargaining
7. Rewarding service and the scholarship of teaching
8. Aligning priorities/rewards and mission
9. Restructuring doctoral programs.

Every aspect of the faculty role and work life is being reconceptualized and changes implemented. In fact, the dramatic rise in contract and part-time faculty illustrates that change is not on the way, but has occurred. Workload and productivity, attacks of tenure, changing roles, and lack of diversity among faculty have been themes throughout the 1990s. However, many new themes have emerged that may show promise for assisting in this time of transition, such as restructuring of doctoral programs, the scholarship of teaching, and the rewarding of service (in addition to aligning faculty rewards and institutional mission). But the rise in part-time and contract faculty, the growing antagonism represented in the growth of collective bargaining, and the lack of diversification of faculty represent serious problems that loom large for the academy.

The New Faculty

Graying: Colleges and universities underwent massive expansion in the 1950s and 1960s; as a result, a large number of faculty were hired who have now reached retirement age. With the retirement age cap being lifted in the early 1990s, many faculty decided to stay on rather than retire, increasing the average age even more (Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Gilmartin, S. K). A survey of 33,785 faculty in 378 colleges and universities found nearly one-third were 55 or older, compared with one-quarter a decade ago. Over the same period, the proportion of

faculty under 45 has fallen from 41 to 34 percent. A study by the University of Wisconsin called "The Graying of the Faculty in the UW System" highlighted the problems that will be faced by institutions in the coming years. Findings indicated that: (1) in 1997-98, 35 percent of faculty were age 55 and older, 51 percent were between 40 and 54, and fewer than 15 percent were under 40; (2) faculty age distribution varied across academic disciplines, with engineering and physical sciences having both the highest percentage in the 55 and older age group and the highestpercentage of faculty under 40; (3) between 1985-86 and 1997-98 the total number of UW system faculty declined by 9.8 percent; however, the number of faculty 55 and over increased by 18 percent and the number under age 40 declined by 41.4 percent, which changed the age distribution. Based on historical retirement rates, it is projected that 2,384 faculty members (close to 40 percent) system wide will retire over the next decade. Campuses need to plan for this upcoming change. The impact of massive retirement, the pipeline of new faculty, and the generational divide between younger and older faculty are not being examined in research. These are important areas for future studies.

Lacking ethnic diversity: While more women are in academe, ethnic diversification has not progressed (Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Gilmartin, S. K.). The lack of diversification of the faculty has received great attention and many ideas exist for ways to increase the representation, including mentoring, growing your own programs, using incentive lines where the administration rather than the department pay for the faculty line, and recruiting aggressively. Research needs to identify why these many strategies are not creating change: Are strategies not being used? If implemented, are they not being executed properly? If executed properly, why are the numbers not increasing? We need to better understand why the many strong ideas for diversifying the faculty are failing. Although the literature is full of advice for ways diversify, we lack an understanding of why this is not occurring.

Internationalized

Over the past five years, more faculty are studying abroad or are conducting research abroad than in previous years. More campuses are providing opportunities for their faculty, with the hope that this will help internationalize campuses' curricula. One study examined the short-term study-abroad experiences of college faculty and the global content of their classroom teaching. It found that experience abroad enhanced the social and self-awareness of participants, which in turn led to increased global content of classroom teaching. (Sandgren, D., Ellig, N., Hovde, P., Krejci, M., & Rice, M.). These types of studies help to promote efforts that work to diversify campuses. Two institutions that have developed model programs that provide faculty with foreign study opportunities through a consortium for faculty development are profiled in one article that should be helpful to educators (Heller, R.). Although there is much in the practice literature, few researchers are examining internationalization.

Part-time Faculty & Contract Faculty

Perhaps no other trend was more evident in the literature than the condition of and growth of part-time faculty. Several reports profiled the growth of this sector (James C. P.); (Weschler, H.). Part-time faculty employment has roughly doubled over the last twenty years, with temporary

faculty especially prevalent in English, History, Modern Language, and Mathematics. Women hold 47 percent of part-time positions. (Pratt, L. R.). Some observers fear that women and minorities will constitute the majority of this sector, and they do. But there is not evidence yet that this is necessarily problematic.

Studies examining the impact of the increase in part-time faculty on institutions of higher education demonstrated that this trend is having a negative result. As in other industries, expansion of part-time work has profoundly affected salaries and working conditions of full-time faculty and staff at many colleges (Aronowitz, S.). For example, in a study of part-timers, it was discovered that their work lives are often fairly difficult, with such high workloads that they have little time to work on course development and are forced to present material routinely. One paper suggested that the current situation of marginalization and dual labor forces is the result of market and corporate paradigms. The situation can be expected to persist unless full-time and part-time faculty unite in advocating that part-timers be afforded opportunities to contribute to course development and to develop their teaching skills. Some observers suggest that full-time faculty do not comment about conditions for part-timers since they fear it will impact their work lives (but it already is). Another reason given for the growth of part-time faculty and nontenure- track faculty is the national crisis in support for liberal arts education and the increasing demand for technology education taught by part-timers or adjuncts. With most of the observable trends in higher education moving in the direction of responding to the demands of business, new technology, distance education, and building partnerships with nonacademic communities, the humanities and the centrality of classroom teaching are being side-stepped (Pratt, L. R.). There are clearly competing values systems operating (this is also discussed at length in the ERIC Trends in Administration).

Another study that examined the use of part-time faculty focused on college policies and practices influencing hiring of part-timers, problems emerging from part-time appointments, and policy and structural changes needed to increase the effectiveness of part-time faculty. It concluded that while the problems cannot be resolved to everyone's satisfaction, institutional culture can be a vehicle for improving satisfaction and productivity (Jacobs, F.). Few studies of part-time faculty found that their work conditions are positive (in general) or that they can contribute in the same ways as full-time faculty.

Much research is needed on the increasing use of part-time and adjunct faculty, the institutional setting for part-time employment; faculty career patterns and workload, incentives and disincentives; role of this group in the academic community; and implications for maintaining the quality of higher education. Most of these questions remain only partially answered.

Growth of Contract Faculty

In addition to the growth of part-time faculty, other non-traditional faculty roles, such as the contract faculty position, are emerging (*Facing Change: Building the Faculty of the Future*). These faculty have full-time appointments for a certain length of time. Studies on the impact of contract faculty within institutions also illustrate some problems; yet the few problems may not

outweigh the benefits in terms of cost and flexibility to institutions. For example, a case study of a large research university analyzed the increasing use of nontenured faculty, examining both benefits and costs to the institution. Origins of the expansion are examined, arrangements used to resolve staffing problems are described, and their effectiveness and general consequences for departments are assessed. It is concluded that while short-term negative outcomes can be addressed with policy, economic and reputational outcomes are more problematic (Tolbert, P.S.). Many commentators note that we can no longer operate under past employment practices due to cost constraints and affordability concerns (Facing Change: Building the Faculty of the Future). We need to understand how to balance the market forces, public demand for lower costs, and issues of academic quality. Model practices need comparison and analysis.

Redefining Research

Technology: Technology is allowing for greater collaboration among researchers, a more internationalized research process, and quicker production of research results. Electronic publishing, the move toward on-line journals, and sites where pre-publication results are published have helped to bring research to faculty on a more timely basis (Givler, P.). It has the potential to create more innovation and collaboration. Internet collaboration among laboratories allows scientists to work together at a distance, and will eventually enable researchers to examine microscope-produced images simultaneously and participate in meetings and seminars remotely. If the venture succeeds, the resulting technology will allow smaller institutions to cooperate more easily. Scientists will still have to balance benefits of cooperation with the competitive nature of research, especially as research becomes seen as important to revenue generation for institutions (Kiernan, V.).

Revenue: There is a trend toward faculty conducting research for revenue generation to support dwindling finances, especially in other countries. The Technical University of Hamburg-Harburg (Germany), a member of a new European consortium of innovative universities, has been broadening its revenue base by conducting research and training for industry and local government and marketing the technical advances developed in its own laboratories (Bollag, B.). This is another area in which legal issues and other factors need greater examination.

Application: Because institutions have become more focused on meeting the needs of external constituencies (See ERIC Trends in External Constituencies, Outreach and Public Relations), conducting research to directly benefit society has become more important. One outgrowth of this trend is more multidisciplinary research teams which are well-equipped to attack complex issues. Actually succeeding in such endeavors is not easy. Research has begun to explore problems that may arise in multidisciplinary research teams and offers suggestions to help teams reach their goals. This research also offers advice to administrators for supporting multidisciplinary efforts in overcoming potential difficulties (Younglove-Webb, J., Gray, B., Abdalla, C. W., & Thurow, A. P.).

The Fall of Tenure and Rise of Faculty Productivity

Questioning the tenure system is certainly not a new trend, but it continues to gain momentum

among legislators, governing boards, and the general public. One article provided an overview of the arguments as they currently stand, including problems associated with tenure, financial and educational perspectives on faculty productivity, possible alternatives to tenure, and implications for academic freedom. Post-tenure review was examined as a compromise between traditional tenure and proposed alternatives (Trower, C.). As noted in the ERIC Policy Trends, post-tenure review is an extremely popular policy that has been mostly successful. The emphasis on post-tenure review has also resulted in the need to better document performance. One example of this effort is *Faculty Performance Reports*-- a project to measure faculty work at the University of Southern California, exemplifying the collaborative approach to producing an assessment instrument that both documents an individual's productivity in research, teaching, and service and determines the worth of his/her activities in relation to institutional goals (Bensimon, E. M., & O'Neil, H. F., Jr.).

But will documenting performance be enough when many of the issues are financial? One study of Canadian higher education presents a model explaining why recent cutbacks in government grants, cost pressures on university budgets, tuition increase caps, and declining interest in attending less prestigious institutions have resulted in pressure on tenure in Canadian universities. Unless tenure is reconsidered, universities may face increasing faculty collective bargaining conflict (Hum, D.). Post-tenure review and faculty performance reports will not alleviate the financial pressures. But interesting trends are emerging on the financial front that might alter this situation (see ERIC Financial Trends).

Collective Bargaining

Lawsuits related to faculty work conditions have been on the rise and are becoming increasingly commonplace within the academy. An example is three law suits filed by part-time community college faculty members in Washington State for retirement benefits, health care benefits, and unpaid wages and overtime. The article reported on the development of a lobbying group among the state's thousands of part-time faculty (Lords, E.). A few careful observers noted that faculty are becoming "Managed Professionals" confined by the contracts they establish to protect their rights (Rhoades, G.). Although collective bargaining is an important concern for campuses, little research exists. Moreover, even though collective bargaining has been the focus of research in other countries, it has received little attention in the United States. The confluence of forces in the environment suggest that collective bargaining is an area that needs more attention from both administrators and researchers.

There has also been a rise in the literature about graduate student teaching assistant unionization. Although prevalent in the mind of some practitioners, little research has been conducted in this area that relates to either impact or degree, e.g., number of students or campuses. The literature mostly discusses opinions for and against unionization on campus, the value of unions for teaching assistants, and the nature of the graduate student-college relationship. Occasionally the legal implications are discussed. This is also an area in need of research.

Aligning Rewards and Mission

Many institutions realize they have overemphasized faculty research in the reward system and are beginning to reconsider this system. One exemplary book provided guidelines for developing a coherent faculty rewards system, starting with the articulation of institutional priorities and following the process through the development of departmental guidelines and union contracts. It included samples of documents used in a wide range of institutions that have matched their policies to their priorities. There are many steps required to develop such a revised system and it must be considered a long-term plan. Steps include getting the need for a revised faculty rewards system on the institutional agenda; developing an institutional mission statement; creating institutional and school/college guidelines; instituting departmental guidelines; and developing a union contract that supports a quality faculty rewards system (Diamond, R. M.). This effort is happening simultaneously with efforts to reward service and teaching.

Rewarding Service and the Scholarship of Teaching

Service and teaching are often not strong factors in tenure and promotion decisions because these processes are difficult to document and assess. In the last few years, models have been developed for helping institutional leaders create systems to assess faculty on these other two important aspects of the faculty role. One study analyzed aspects of assistant professor promotion and tenure packets that contained varying emphases on outreach associated with a positive promotion recommendation (Knox, A. B). The trend toward documenting teaching has been labeled "thescholarship of teaching." One aspect of the scholarship of teaching is classroom research which addresses the why and how of learning, encouraging teachers to use their classrooms as laboratories for the study of learning. Classroom research has the potential for creating teaching and learning communities with the shared goal of understanding learning well enough to improve it (Cross, K. P.). The American Association for Higher Education has a national initiative focused on developing research related to what constitutes good teaching and how it can be assessed and documented for tenure files.

Restructuring the Doctoral Degree

In addition to institutional restructuring, national organizations and disciplinary societies have been meeting and developing programs and ideas for redesigning the doctoral degree. Some of the problems noted include: overemphasis on research, the desire for many faculty to work at a handful of institutions, and the lack of diverse students and faculty in graduate education. These problems are being attributed partly to the organization of doctoral programs. Reports and commissions around the country are working to restructure the traditional Ph.D. program. One helpful report outlined the details of a restructured and strengthened Ph.D. program in higher education administration at the University of Toledo (Ohio). (*A Restructured Ph.D. Program in Higher Education Administration*). Acknowledging that the whole system must change to impact the professoriate is an important first step. More research needs to be conducted on these new efforts at redesigning doctoral programs and should link to research on rewarding service and the scholarship of teaching.

Conclusion

Faculty remain the core of higher education institutions; their work and role are integral to the learning environment and mission of the institution. The literature on this group is quite rich and many important new models and ideas are being developed related to faculty roles and lives. Unfortunately, these discussions are for the most part happening outside of the faculty, among legislatures, college presidents and administrators. Integrating disciplinary societies into both the efforts of practitioners and researchers is important in rethinking this crucial role. Some promising examples are efforts to resocialize new faculty and to integrate community service learning; both initiatives are working directly with disciplinary societies.

Another summative comment is that institutions face significant issues related to faculty roles, from internationalization, integration of technology, increasing outreach, to decreasing institutional costs. These complex and interrelated issues need to be examined together rather than separately, as they typically are engaged. Hopefully, describing these issues together in this trend analysis will help to facilitate these types of institutional discussions and visions of research.

Bibliography

Aronowitz, S. (1998). Are unions good for professors? Academe, 84, 6, 12-17.

Bensimon, E. M., & O'Neil, H. F., Jr. (1998). Collaborative effort to measure faculty work. Liberal Education, 84, 4, 22-31.

Bollag, B. (1999). A new type of German university takes root in Hamburg. Chronicle of Higher Education, 45, 28, A49-A50.

Cross, K. P. (1998). Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 75, 5-12.

Diamond, R. M. (1999). Aligning faculty rewards with institutional mission. Statements, policies, and guidelines. New York: Anker Publishing Company.

Facing change: Building the faculty of the future. (1999). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Givler, P. (1999). Books in bytes? Not yet. Academe, 85, 5, 61-64.

The graying of the faculty in the UW system. (1999). University of Wisconsin System, Occasional Research Brief, 99, 1.

Heller, R. (1999). Developing a globally oriented faculty. Peer Review, 1, 2, 12-14.

Hum, D. (1998). Tenure, faculty contracts and bargaining conflict. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 28, 2-3, 47-70.

Jacobs, F. (1998). Using part-time faculty more effectively. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 104, 26, 4, 9-18.

Kiernan, V. (1999). Internet-based "collaboraties" help scientists work together. Chronicle of Higher Education, 45, 27, A22-A23.

Knox. A. B. (1998). Recognizing excellent outreach performance. WI:

Lords, E. (1999). Part-time faculty members sue for better pay and benefits. Chronicle of Higher Education, 46, 8, A16-A18.

Pratt, L. R. (1998). The rise of temporary faculty appointments and the decline of liberal arts.

Paper presented at the National Council of Teachers of English Conference on College Composition and Communication (49th, Chicago, IL, April 1-4).

A restructured Ph.D. program in higher education administration. (1997). Toledo, OH: Toledo University.

Sandgren, D., Ellig, N., Hovde, P., Krejci, M., & Rice, M. (1999). How international experience affects teaching: Understanding the impact of faculty study abroad. Journal of Studies in International Education, 3, 1, 33-56.

Sax, L. J., Astin, A. W.; Korn, W. S., & Gilmartin, S. K. (1999). The American college teacher: National norms for the 1998-99 HERI faculty survey. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.

Tolbert, P. S. (1998). Two-tiered faculty systems and organizational outcomes. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 104, 26, 4, 71-80.

Trower, C. (1999). The trouble with tenure. National Forum, 79, 1, 24-29.

Wechsler, H. (Ed.). The NEA 1999 almanac of higher education. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Younglove-Webb, J., Gray, B., Abdalla, C. W., & Thurow, A. P. (1999). The dynamics of multidisciplinary research teams in academia. Review of Higher Education, 22, 4, 425- 440.